UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,319	04/03/2001	Michael F. Lahn	2879-80	4155

22442 7590 01/13/2003

SHERIDAN ROSS PC
1560 BROADWAY
SUITE 1200
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER
SCHWADRON, RONALD B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1644	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/826,319	LAHN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) 1,2,9-35 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

1. Applicant's election without traverse of the species αβ TCR in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged.

2. Claims 3-8 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 8.

3. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration (the date of signing by Inventor Born). See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

4. The information disclosure statement file 10/5/2001 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because it lacks copies of the cited references. The information disclosure statement filed 10/5/2001 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1,9-11,18,19,24,25,27,28,31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lobb et al. (US Patent 5,871,734) as evidenced by Arrhenius et al. (US Patent 5,869,448).

Lobb et al. teach use of antibody against VLA-4 to treat asthma (see abstract). VLA-4 is a receptor on T cells (see Arrhenius et al., column 63, last paragraph). AHR occurs in asthma (see colum 12, Example 2). Lobb et al. teach aerosol administration of antiVLA-4 antibody (see column 12, Example 2). Lobb et al. teach use of humanized antiVLA-4 antibody (see column 5, penultimate paragraph). It is an inherent property of said antibody that it does not stimulate T cell activation (said antibodies inhibit VLA-4 function, see colum 7, penultimate paragraph). Lobb et al. teach use of monovalent antibody (see column 7, third paragraph). Lobb et al. teach use of antibody dosages encompassed by those recited in claims 18 and 19 (see column 6, penultimate paragraph). Lobb et al. teach administration of said antibody in PBS via nebulized spray (see column 6, penultimate paragraph). Lobb et al. teach the method of claim 27 (see claim 17). Lobb et al. teach the method of claims 28,31,32 (see column 12, Example 2). Lobb et al. teach that the effect seen can be achieved without detectable blood levels of antibody (see column 12, last paragraph) wherein the antibody would not therefore substantially effect peripheral immune function (eg. because it was not present in the blood). Lobb et al. teach use of said method in humans (see claim 16). Lobb et al. teach that their method resulted in a 70% decrease in inhibition of late phase response which would correlate with the improved FEV1 as per claim 34.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1-3,9-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobb et al. (US Patent 5,871,734) as evidenced by Arrhenius et al. (US Patent 5,869,448) in view of Schramm et al.

Lobb et al. teach use of antibody against VLA-4 to treat asthma (see abstract). It is a property of VLA-4 that it is a receptor on T cells (see Arrhenius et al., column 63, last paragraph). AHR occurs in asthma (see colum 12, Example 2). Lobb et al. teach aerosol administration of antiVLA-4 antibody (see column 12, Example 2). Lobb et al. teach use of humanized antiVLA-4 antibody (see column 5, penultimate paragraph). Said antibody that it does not stimulate T cell activation (said antibodies inhibit VLA-4 function, see colum 7, penultimate paragraph). Lobb et al. teach use of monovalent antibody (see column 7, third paragraph). Lobb et al. teach use of antibody dosages encompassed by those recited in claims 18 and 19 (see column 6, penultimate paragraph). Lobb et al. teach administration of said antibody in PBS via

nebulized spray (see column 6, penultimate paragraph). Lobb et al. teach the method of claim 27 (see claim 17). Lobb et al. teach the method of claims 28,31,32 (see column 12, Example 2). Lobb et al. teach that the effect seen can be achieved without detectable blood levels of antibody (see column 12, last paragraph) wherein the antibody would not therefore substantially effect peripheral immune function (eg. because it was not present in the blood). Lobb et al. teach use of said method in humans (see claim 16). Lobb et al. teach that their method resulted in a 70% decrease in inhibition of late phase response which would correlate with the improved FEV1 as per claim 34. Lobb et al. do not teach use of antiTCR αβ antibodies. Schramm et al. teach use of IV antiTCR αβ antibodies to treat asthma (see abstract). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have created the claimed invention because Lobb et al. teach aerosol administration of an antibody which binds T cells to treat asthma and Schramm et al. teach that a different antibody which binds T cells (antiTCR αβ) can be used to treat asthma. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do the aforementioned because Lobb et al. teach that the anti T cell antibody can be administered in a variety of art known routes including aerosol. A neutralizing antibody would have been used in the claimed method because Schramm et al. teach that asthma symptoms are reduced in the absence of αβ T cells (see abstract). Regarding the particular dosages of formulation or dosage per weight, a routineer would initially test a wide variety of different dosages in order to have determined the smallest effective dose of the antibody used. A routineer would have administered said antibody in conjunction with art known treatments for asthma such as those disclosed in column 2, first paragraph of Lobb et al. The antibody would have been administered either before or during asthma symptoms.

9. No claim is allowed.

10. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 at (703) 305-3014.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Ron Schwadron whose telephone number is (703) 308-4680. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30 to 6:00. A message may be left on the examiners voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Christina Chan can be reached on (703) 308-3973. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

RONALD B. SCHWADRON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800 1600

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1644